

REMARKS

The Examiner is thanked for the Official Action dated February 24, 2005 and the indication of allowable subject matter. This Amendment and Request for Reconsideration is intended to be fully responsive to the Official Action.

Claims 1-4, 7, 9, 11, 13, 14 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Moon et al. (USP 5,761,824). This rejection is respectfully traversed in view of the above amendment and the following comments.

As discussed during the personal interview conducted on April 21, 2005, Applicant has amended claims 1 and 3 to clarify the structure of the ion generator as well as the treatment modes of the apparatus. During the personal interview, the Examiner agreed that these amendments likely would overcome the current rejections made in view of Moon et al. '824.

It is submitted that the foregoing comments and amendments resolve all outstanding issues and place this application in condition for allowance. If the examiner believes that additional discussion would advance the prosecution of the present invention, she is encouraged to contact the undersigned at the phone number listed below.

It is believed that no charges are due for this submission. However, if this is incorrect, then please debit Account 50-0548 and notify the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,



Matthew W. Stavish
Registration No. 36,286

Liniak, Berenato & White
6550 Rock Spring Drive
Suite 240
Bethesda, Maryland 20817
(301) 896-0600